



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,662	10/29/2003	Pedro Manrique	HI03025USU (P04009USU)	2482
7590 08/24/2006 Jennifer H. Hammond 10453 Raintree Lane Northridge, CA 91326			EXAMINER FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN	
			ART UNIT 2128	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,662

Applicant(s)

MANRIQUE, PEDRO

Examiner

Russell Frejd

Art Unit

2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

In re Application of: Manrique

Examination of Application #10/697,662

1. Claims 1-72 of application 10/697,662, filed on 29-October-2003, are presented for examination.

Specification Objections

2. The disclosure is objected to due to numerous instances where the spacing of letters in some of the words renders the words grammatically incorrect. Although there are numerous instances which require correction, two examples are p. 2, sec. 0006, and p. 3, sec. 0007.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 3.1 Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The invention claims (claim 1 preamble), "*A method for designing a waveguide.*"
- 3.2 MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii) provides that a statutory computer process is determined not by how the computer performs the process, but by what the computer does to achieve a practical application with a useful, concrete and tangible result. For example, a computer process that simply calculates a mathematical algorithm that models noise is

In re Application of: Manrique

nonstatutory, while a claimed process for digitally filtering noise employing the mathematical algorithm is statutory. The long line of cases in this area that are referred to in MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii) exemplify this requirement, by utilizing in the claim language, terms such as controlling, executing, changing and removing. In view of the aforementioned requirement and the interim guidelines for 101 subject matter eligibility, the Examiner respectfully contends that the claim language of independent claims 1, 18, 32, 38, 44 and 61, do not claim a practical application or provide a useful, concrete and tangible result, that language claiming: (In regard to claim 1)

establishing (emphasis added) a design metric;

dividing the waveguide into two or more sections;

setting initial design values; and

modifying the values for each section in accordance with the design metric.

3.3 For at least these reasons, the Examiner respectfully posits that the claims of the present invention do not meet the criteria for a statutory process. Accordingly, the claims are determined to be a method for designing a waveguide, consisting solely of mathematical operations, converting one set of numbers into another set of numbers, whereby the method does not manipulate appropriate subject matter, and thus cannot constitute a statutory process (MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(c)).

3.4 The Examiner also posits that the method of the present invention is computer executable software code, or a program per se, consisting of a signal-bearing medium having software instructions [see claims 44-72] that implement the method for designing a waveguide. For at least this reason, the software instructions of the present invention do not meet the criteria

In re Application of: Manrique

for a statutory process.

3.5 In view of the aforementioned requirement, the Examiner respectfully contends that the claim language of independent claims 44-72 do not claim a practical application, that language claiming a signal-bearing medium having software for designing a waveguide. The medium holding instructions is determined to recite data embodied on a computer-readable medium. However, the data does not impart functionality to either the data as claimed or to the computer. As such, the claimed invention recites non-functional descriptive material, *i.e.*, mere data. Non-functional descriptive material is merely carried on the medium, it is not structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium, and thereby does not manipulate, or execute, appropriate subject matter, and thus cannot constitute a statutory process (MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(c)).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4.1 Claims 1, 15, 17, 18, 29, 31, 32, 38, 44, 46, 58, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the article authored by Bangtsson et al., hereinafter Bangtsson, entitled *Shape optimization of an Acoustic Horn*.

4.2 Bangtsson discloses: In regard to claims 1 and 44: A method for designing a waveguide, the method comprising: establishing a design metric [p. 1537, sec. 2.2]; dividing the

In re Application of: Manrique

waveguide into two or more sections [p. 1538, sec. 2.3]; setting initial design values [p. 1540, sec. 3.1]; and modifying the values for each section in accordance with the design metric [p. 1541, sec. 3.2].

Claims 15, 29, 58 and 72: the waveguide is designed for the use in connection with a loudspeaker [p. 1534, par. 2].

Claims 17, 31 and 60: the waveguide is designed for use in a communications application [p. 1534, par. 2].

Claims 18, 32, 38 and 61: A method for designing a waveguide, the method comprising: developing an initial waveguide profile with two or more different exponential slopes concatenated together [p. 1538, sec. 2.3]; modifying the slopes based upon a design metric; and smoothing the modified slopes based upon a polynomial order curve fit [p. 1541, sec. 3.2].

Claim 46: logic configured for smoothing the sections that are concatenated together [p. 1541, sec. 3.2].

Claim Objections

5. Claims 2-14, 16, 19-28, 30, 33-37, 39-43, 45,, 47-57, 59, and 62-72 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In re Application of: Manrique

Response Guidelines

6. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

6.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday from 0530 to 1400 ET, **or** the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Date: 20-August-2006



**RUSSELL FREJD
PRIMARY EXAMINER**